

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

PAGE 6

Serial No.: 09/933,889

Filing Date: August 20, 2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.250US01

Title: REDUCING NOISE ON COMMUNICATIONS LINES

---

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2005 as well as the art cited. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over So et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,761), hereinafter referred to as So, in view of Bella (U.S. Patent No. 6,644,735). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a channel card communicating asymmetric digital subscriber line (ADSL) traffic over a communication line. The channel card includes an asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) section providing an interface to a cell bus of a chassis and providing ATM processing of cells, and a transceiver section, coupled to the ATM section, the transceiver section including at least one subscriber port, the transceiver section providing for modulation and demodulation of data for the at least one subscriber port, the transceiver section including a common mode choke for reducing noise on the communication line.

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither So nor Bella, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the card of claim 1. In particular, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time the invention was made "to incorporate a common mode choke such as the one taught by Bella into the communication network of So with the motivation being that it provides capability for reducing interferences, thus enhancing signal transmission." In assessing the motivation to combine the references, the Examiner has provided no evidentiary basis to support the assertion that So suffers from the problems with common mode noise. Absent such evidence, the combination of the references is improper. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of So with Bella. In particular, Bella does not teach or suggest a transceiver section including a common mode choke as called for in claim 1. The Examiner's citation of Column 7,

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

PAGE 7

Serial No.: 09/933,889

Filing Date: August 20, 2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.250US01

Title: REDUCING NOISE ON COMMUNICATIONS LINES

---

lines 44-47 of Bella as evidence that Bella teaches the use of the common mode choke of Claim 1 does not appear to relate to the processing of ADSL signals in an ADSL transceiver. The inductor L1 cited in Column 7, lines 44-47 of Bella relates to filter network 230 of Figure 2 of Bella, which, as stated in Bella, "filters voiceband [analog] signals between the twisted pair 202 and the PSTN 232" (Column 4, lines 41-43) and appears to bypass ADSL transceiver 210 of Figure 2. Therefore, there is nothing in Bella or So, alone or in combination, that teaches or suggests that a common mode choke is necessary or desirable for a transceiver section of a channel card for communicating ADSL traffic over a communication line.

Therefore, based on the foregoing arguments, it is submitted that claim 1 is not obvious in light of the combination and should be allowed.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is directed to a method for reducing common mode noise on a communication line carrying asynchronous subscriber line (ADSL) signals. The method includes receiving ATM cells having data for transmission over the communication line, processing the cells to remove the data, preparing the data for transmission as ADSL signals over the communication line, and passing the ADSL signals through a common mode choke to reduce noise in the ADSL signals prior to transmission.

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither So nor Bella, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the card of claim 6. Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 6 is not obvious in light of the combination and should be allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowance of claims 7-15.

Claims 2-5 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has not amended these claims in light of the arguments presented above with respect to Claim 1.

## AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

PAGE 8

Serial No.: 09/933,889

Filing Date: August 20, 2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.250US01

Title: REDUCING NOISE ON COMMUNICATIONS LINES

---

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2006

---

David N. Fogg  
Reg. No. 35,138

Attorneys for Applicant  
Fogg and Associates, LLC  
P.O. Box 581339  
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339  
T - (612) 332-4720  
F - (612) 332-4731